



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/994,554

11/27/2001

Kenneth S. Bloom

17724 USA

8757

7590

09/26/2006

Nirav D. Parikh 25-LDP
Owens-Illinois, Inc.
One SeaGate
Toledo, OH 43666

EXAMINER

HYLTON, ROBIN ANNETTE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3727

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/994,554	Applicant(s) BLOOM ET AL.	
	Examiner Robin A. Hylton	Art Unit 3727	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-24, 34-46 and 59-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-24, 34-46 and 59-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 3-24, 34-46, and 59-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims set forth the “disk loosely retained parallel to but separate from” the base wall, but provides *no structure* for this occurrence. How is the “disk loosely retained parallel to but separate from” the base wall? Although the claims are read in light of the specification, limitations of the specification are not read into the claims.

2. Claims 3-24, 34-46, and 59-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims set forth the “disk loosely retained parallel to but separate from” the base wall, but provides *no structure* for this to occur. How is the “disk loosely retained parallel to but separate from” the base wall? Although the claims are read in light of the specification, limitations of the specification are not read into the claims.

3. Claims 3-24, 34-46, and 59-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the claims are rejected for the following reasons:

The claims set forth the “disk loosely retained parallel to but separate from” the base wall, but provides *no structure* for this occurrence. How is the “disk loosely retained parallel to

Art Unit: 3727

but separate from" the base wall? Although the claims are read in light of the specification, limitations of the specification are not read into the claims.

Dependent claims not specifically mentioned are rejected as depending from rejected base claims since they inherently contain the same deficiencies therein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 3-8, 13-20, 37-42, 59, 60, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano (US 5,984,124) in view of McBride et al. (US 6,761,275).

Takano teaches the claimed closure and container except for the resilient liner molded onto the disk 9. See column 3, lines 19-21 regarding the plastic material. See figure 6 depicting the protrusion 14 extending around a peripheral portion of the flat disk.

McBride teaches it is known to mold a resilient liner 40 onto a disk 30.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of a resilient liner molded onto the disk for engaging the mouth of an associated container. Doing so provides a more effective and reliable seal between the closure cap and the container.

Regarding the liner as a barrier layer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the resilient liner of a barrier material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. Doing so maintains the integrity of the container contents against degradation.

Art Unit: 3727

It is noted that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate.

6. Claims 11,12,22-24,45,46 and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Racine et al (US 6,881,793) in view of McBride.

Racine teaches a closure having a plastic disk 28 having a flat base wall with a depending annular ring and a depending rib located radially outwardly of the ring. Racine does not teach a resilient liner molded onto the disk.

McBride teaches it is known to mold a resilient liner 40 onto a disk 30.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of a resilient liner molded onto the disk for engaging the mouth of an associated container. Doing so provides a more effective and reliable seal between the closure cap and the container.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 9,10,21,34-36,43,44 appear to avoid the art and to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims illustrate the disk of figure 9 of the instant application.

Terminal Disclaimer

8. The terminal disclaimer filed on June 12, 2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US Patent No. 6,874,647 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments, see section "Takano 5,984,124 combined with JP 2-258325" on pages 3-6, filed June 12, 2006, with respect to claims 3-8,13-20, 37-42,59,60,64, and 65 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of these claims in view thereof has been withdrawn.

10. Applicant's arguments filed June 12, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the rejection under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs, the phrase "loosely retained" implies the plastic disk may fall out of the shell. Thus, some structure of the closure must be present and capable of preventing the separation of the plastic disk from the shell. Applicant points to the prior art for support of the phrase "loosely retained". It is pointed out that Racine and Takano set forth closure structure to keep the disk from separating from the shell. The inclusion of a retaining structure or the deletion of "loosely" would overcome the rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

While both the patents to Takano and Racine teach a plastic disk for sealing against the associated container wall, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made looking for a disk which provides a more resilient seal and/or reduction of content degradation

Art Unit: 3727

would turn to a known teaching in the prior art. McBride provides this teaching. The other structure present in McBride is not used in the rejection, and should not be read into the rejection of the claims.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06 II(A), MPEP 2163.06 and MPEP 714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Art Unit: 3727

13. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (571) 273-8300. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3720 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

14. It is called to applicant's attention that if a communication is faxed before the reply time has expired, applicant may submit the reply with a "Certificate of Facsimile" which merely asserts that the reply is being faxed on a given date. So faxed, before the period for reply has expired, the reply may be considered timely. A suggested format for a certificate follows:

I hereby certify that this correspondence for Application Serial No. _____ is being facsimiled to The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via fax number 571-273-8300 on the date shown below:

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate

Signature _____

Date _____

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robin Hylton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4540. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse, can be reached on (571) 272-4544.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

Art Unit: 3727

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Other helpful telephone numbers are listed for applicant's benefit:

- Allowed Files & Publication (888) 786-0101
- Assignment Branch (800) 972-6382
- Certificates of Correction (703) 305-8309
- Fee Questions (571) 272-6400
- Inventor Assistance Center (800) PTO-9199
- Petitions/special Programs (571) 272-3282
- Information Help line 1-800-786-9199
- Internet PTO-Home Page <http://www.uspto.gov>

RAH

September 18, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Hylton', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Robin A. Hylton
Primary Examiner
GAU 3727